Updated for 11-26-02 Meeting

Work-In-Progress Ideas Listing

Cost Savings & Efficiency Work Group

WATER ----------

1. **Utility Policies Regarding Materials and Line Size** – The City has policies regulating the size of and materials used for water and sewer lines. There should be further discussion concerning these policies. For example, should major lines be sized for ultimate development conditions or with future parallel lines accommodated in the design? Should there be different policies for transmission vs. distribution lines?

2. **Use of Water and Sanitary Sewer Enterprise Funds for Street Construction Projects** – Any water or sanitary sewer line adjustment costs relating to a street construction project should be paid for out of the respective water and/or sanitary sewer enterprise fund rather than from street construction funds. Potential savings is estimated by a Work Group member at $61,120 per mile.

3. **Create Water and Waste Water Utility Oversight Boards Like LES** – Institute a system of oversight boards for the City's water and wastewater utilities that would be modeled after the LES Board.

WASTEWATER ----------

1. **Utility Policies Regarding Materials and Line Size** – The City has policies regulating the size of and materials used for water and sewer lines. There should be further discussion concerning these policies. For example, should major lines be sized for ultimate development conditions or with future parallel lines accommodated in the design? Should there be different policies for transmission vs. distribution lines?

2. **Use of Water and Sanitary Sewer Enterprise Funds for Street Construction Projects** – Any water or sanitary sewer line adjustment costs relating to a street construction project should be paid for out of the respective water and/or sanitary sewer enterprise fund rather than from street construction funds. Potential savings is estimated by a Work Group member at $61,120 per mile.

3. **Create Water and Waste Water Utility Oversight Boards Like LES** – Institute a system of oversight boards for the City's water and wastewater utilities that would be modeled after the LES Board.

STREETS ----------

1. **Costs for Sidewalks and Street Trees Along Arterials** – Developers working adjacent to arterials post sureties to guarantee the installation of sidewalks and street trees. How were these expenses accounted for in the projected arterial street costs calculated by Public Works & Utilities?

2. **Costs for Retaining Walls** – Should the cost of retaining walls be included in the projected future cost of an arterial? This cost could be reduced with the use of the 120 ft. right-of-way and refinement of grading standards.

3. **Width of Driving and Turning Lanes, and Striping Policy**– City has been using the standard of 12 ft. lane widths in calculating future arterial costs. Should this standard be reduced to a narrow lane width to save construction costs? Also, should look at striping policies and how they are applied throughout the community.

4. **Materials for Street Construction** – Is the City's present policy concerning the use of concrete vs. asphalt in constructing streets and roadways the most cost efficient? Asphalt streets typically last 15 years; in contrast, concrete streets can last 50 or more years.

5. **City Street Standards** – The City has certain standards used in designing future arterials. These standards should be reviewed for possible cost savings.

6. **Right-Of-Way Acquisition Policy** – Savings in roadway cost can be accomplished through the advance acquisition of sufficient public right-of-way. This discussion should include how the City can obtain adequate ROW for future projects through the platting process or other forms of advanced acquisition. Right-of-way should be acquired in advance of development to minimize ROW costs.

7. **Traffic Signal and Pedestrian Signal Assumptions** – The City has assumed that approximately 3.5 traffic signals and 1 pedestrian signal would be needed in the future along major fringe arterials. A Work Group member's analysis indicates that the actual incidence of traffic signals is closer to 1.8 signals per mile; and that pedestrian signals occur on only about 16 percent of the street segments. Using a reduced ratio would lower the projected cost for traffic signals by $212,500 per mile and for pedestrian signals by $40,000 per mile.

8. **Dual Left Turning Lanes on Future Arterials** – The City has assumed the need for dual left turning lanes along future arterial streets. Should this remain the assumption? If not, what are the cost, level of service, future impact, and other implications of this change?

9. **Building Cross Section as Final Cross Section** – Most efficient long term approach is to build the street cross section as it would be projected to be needed at

time of final design. This would be the least disruptive approach both at the time of construction and in the future.

10. **Street Construction Fund Usage** – Review present City polices governing the use of "street construction funds."

PARKS AND TRAILS ----------

1. **Park Districts** – Consider creation of "park districts" for the financing and construction of neighborhood parks. Advance acquisition funds could be used to purchase land prior to development.

STORM WATER ----------

POLICES AND PROCEDURES ----------

1. **"Design-Build" Approach** – Allow the City to enter into a single contract with a partnership of a design professional (i.e., engineering or architectural firm) and construction contractor for a given project. City currently contracts separately with firms to design and build a specific project. This approach would save time by giving the City the ability to negotiate a single agreement resulting in a project that is designed and constructed by a predefined "team" or partnership of firms. Present State purchasing laws governing local jurisdictions in Nebraska may not allow this approach to be used.

2. **Prioritize CIP relative to the Comprehensive Plan** – Give consideration to methods for prioritizing capital improvement program (CIP) projects in relation to the City's Comprehensive Plan phasing. How are projects prioritized now? And how might that process be developed further?

3. **Formalize "Pro rata Ordinance" Approach** – City should clarify and formalize its "oversize standards" and methods for collecting fees from future developments. The City needs to make explicit the circumstances under which it will enter into a agreement for oversizing utility lines, who will pay for the oversizing, and how future developments benefitting from the lines might contribute to the cost of their construction.

4. **City Policy Governing Lift Stations/Force Main vs. Gravity Flow Sanitary Sewer** – The City's current policy is to utilize gravity flow sewers as their primary collection method for sanitary sewers. Lift stations and force mains are discouraged and rarely used.

5. **City Inspection Policy** – The diligent inspection of projects as they are being constructed represents an "insurance policy" against costly repairs and rectification in the future. The City's current crew of inspectors is "under-staffed" and should be expanded.

6. **Platting Procedures** – Are there time efficiencies that could be gained from the present City platting process? This may include issues concerning the review process and fees.

7. **Costs Associated with Relating and Burying LES Lines** – Who pays the cost of relocating and burying LES lines when an arterial is built (or rebuilt?) Is LES contributing to the cost of upgrading or increasing capacity when this situation occurs? It appears that street improvement projects may be funding LES expansions and upgrades.

8. **Reimbursement of Costs for LES Lines** – PW&U has indicated that some "LES costs" are initially paid for out of project budgets; which are then reimbursed by LES; which in turn are reimbursed by City general fund revenues. This policy should be examined further to determine its implications for potential cost savings and for calculating "future project costs" for arterials.

9. **Policy Concerning Developer Contributions to Arterial Projects** – A new City policy may require developers along an arterial to contribute one-half of the cost associated with a "2 through-lanes-and-a-center-turn-lane" facility. Is PW&U giving credit to the developer's contribution in their cost projections?

10. **Phasing of Development in Comprehensive Plan** – The phasing of public services into the new urban areas could occur over a longer period of time. This phasing approach would be a source of significant cost savings.

11. **Use "Indefinite Delivery Contracts" for Public Works & Utility Projects** – "Indefinite delivery contracts" can be used to contract for projects and services as determined by the City at some time in the future. Such contracts contain the general terms (i.e., what sort of work is to be done) and cost/fee schedules (i.e., how much the City would pay for a given unit of work) for future projects or professional services. The contracts would not be "project or service specific" but rather would simply put a private firm in a contractual relationship with the City. It would then be up to the City to determine the specific project to be undertaken by the firm at some point in the future. Contract size (i.e., overall dollar amount such as under $50,000,

$50,000 to $250,000, and over $250,000) could be used to stratify firms and the work they are contracted to complete.

12. **Policies Concerning Potential Projects Not in the CIP and Not in Conformance with the Comprehensive Plan** – There should be a discussion regarding how to handle projects that may not be shown in the City's CIP and that may fall outside of the growth areas shown in the Comprehensive Plan. It may be desirable from an economic development perspective to accommodate such major investments that may not have been planned for or otherwise anticipated.

13. **Executive Order Vs. Special Assessment Districts** – Examine why there are apparent "cost differences" between the use of the "executive order" and "special assessment district" approaches.

14. **Aggregate Water Construction Projects for Bidding** – Lump water projects together to allow contractors to bid on multiple projects over a two year period. Encourage savings through the economy of scale concept.

15. **Professional Service Procurement Procedures** – Consider changes to the ways in which professional services contract are bid and awarded.

16. **Special Assessment Districts** – Discuss reasons why the City is reluctant to make greater use of special assessment districts.

17. **Maintenance Levels in Older Areas** – Examine means for increasing the efficiency of maintenance services in the older areas of the City without adversely impacting the long term quality of the infrastructure.

18. **Communication and Coordination Between Agencies** – Examine means for enhancing the communication and coordination of projects between Public Works and Utilities, LES, LPS, Parks and Recreation, and other city and county agencies.

19. **Grant Writer** – Make greater use of city's grant writer to seek all reasonable available State and Federal grant monies for infrastructure projects.

20. **City Inspection of Project Infrastructure Improvements and Aggressive Follow Up** – Use city's inspection program to ensure that all developer improvements are put in place in a timely and correct fashion, and institute a significant penalty when development infrastructure projects are not completed on time or to standards. Penalty fees could go toward funding additional inspectors.